



Atty. Dkt. No. 059729-0111

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Kazue SAKO

Title:

ELECTRONIC TENDER SYSTEM

Appl. No.:

09/472,900

Filing

12/28/1999

Date:

Examiner:

B. GERHMAN

Art Unit:

2161

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
y certify that this correspondence is

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on the date below.

JACK L. KIRK

(Printed Name)

WOLX-

JULY 23, 2003

(Date of Deposit)

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

RECEIVED

Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified #plisation 13

- [] Small Entity status under 37 C.F.R. § 1.9 and § 1.27 has Geographic Small Entity statement previously submitted.
- [] Small Entity statement is enclosed.
- [X] The fee required for additional claims is calculated below:

	Claims as Amended		Previously Paid For		Extra Claims Presen	_	Rate		Additional Claims Fee
Total Claims:	10	_	20	=	0	×	\$18.00	_	\$0.00
Independents:	3	_	3	=	0	×	\$84.00	=	\$0.00
First presentation	on of any M	ultiple	e Dependen	t Cla	ims:	 +	\$280.00	=	\$0.00
						CLAIMS	FEE TOTAL:		\$0.00

[] Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for the total number of months checked below:

\$0.00	\$110.00	Extension for response filed within the first month:
\$0.00	\$410.00	Extension for response filed within the second month:
\$0.00	\$930.00	Extension for response filed within the third month:
\$0.00	\$1,450.00	Extension for response filed within the fourth month:
\$0.00	\$1,970.00	Extension for response filed within the fifth month:
\$0.00	N FEE TOTAL:	EXTENSIO
\$0.00	\$110.00	Statutory Disclaimer Fee under 37 C.F.R. 1.20(d):
\$0.00	R FEE TOTAL:	CLAIMS, EXTENSION AND DISCLAIME
\$0.00	½ of above):	Small Entity Fees Apply (subtrac
\$0.00	TOTAL FEE:	

- [] Please charge Deposit Account No. 19-0741 in the amount of \$0.00. A duplicate copy of this transmittal is enclosed.
- [] A check in the amount of \$0.00 is enclosed.
- The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned attorney or agent at the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 23, 2003

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428

22428 PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone:

(202) 672-5407 Facsimile: (202) 672-5399 Ronald Coslick

Attorney for Applicant Registration No. 36,489



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:

Kazue SAKO

Title:

ELECTRONIC TENDER SYSTEM

Appl. No.:

09/472,900

Filing Date:

28 December 1999

Examiner:

M. FISHER

Art Unit:

3629

REPLY TO 1 MAY 2003 OFFICIAL ACTION UNDER 37 CFR§1.116

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant hereby replies to the 1 May 2003 official actions in view of the following remarks is requested. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested

REMARKS

Drawings

Approval of the formal drawings filed on 25 September 2002 is again requested.

Prior art rejections

The 1 May 2003 official action addressed claims 1-10. All claims are rejected as being anticipated by or obvious in view of Franklin (U.S. 6,055,518). Applicant has reviewed Franklin in detail and believes that the claims specify subject matter that is substantially different from that of Franklin. The following discussion is provided to highlight those differences.